

09684145

Video
Conf.

LIE
Please
Consider
Attorney's Request
below.

REMARKS

Claims 8-22 were presented for examination and were rejected. Only claim 8 is amended to correct a misspelled word; all of claims 8-22 remain.

Power of Attorney

The November 18, 2003 and March 29, 2004 Office Actions were both sent to the prior attorney for Assignee. A new power of attorney and change of correspondence address was filed with the Office on May 5, 2003, and was filed again with the response to the November 18, 2003 and March 29, 2004 Office Actions. Copies of these papers are *again attached*, making it the fourth time they have been submitted. **THE OFFICE IS REQUESTED TO DIRECT ALL FUTURE CORRESPONDENCE TO THE UNDERSIGNED'S CUSTOMER NUMBER AND ADDRESS.**

Change of Docket Number

Please change the Attorney Docket number in the Office's records to reflect the present attorney's docket number, *i.e.*, 199-0095US.

Claim Rejections

The Examiner rejected claims 8-22 under § 102(e) as anticipated by U.S. Patent 6,025,870 to Hardy ("Hardy"). As discussed below, claims 8-22 each recite at least one limitation not taught or suggested by Hardy, and are therefore allowable over Hardy. Because each independent claim (claims 8, 13, and 19) includes one or more limitations not taught or suggested by Hardy, only the independent claims are discussed herein.

Hardy is drawn to a videoconferencing system that includes a video switch for selecting focus video information. Hardy's system relates to a video switch device capable of "switching an input to a videoconference recording and/or viewing device between multiple available sources in a videoconference system." Hardy at col. 1, ll. 17-20. Like other videoconferencing units typical in the art, the Hardy system includes a videoconferencing unit (VCU) including a network interface for connection to various peripherals located at the near endpoint, *e.g.*, cameras and microphones. Hardy does not,